

PERIODICAL ROOM
RECEIVED
MAY 3 1916
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
LIBRARY

The Classical Weekly

VOL. IX

SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1916

No. 25

SOCRATES: Master of Life

By WILLIAM ELLERY LEONARD

Index and Bibliography. Pp. 120. Bds. \$1.00

OTHER BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Empedocles: Greek Poet and Philosopher. Bds. \$1.00.

Aesop and Hyssop: Fables and Philosophy written in verse—
humorous and picturesque. Cloth \$1.50.

SOCRATES THE MAN AND HIS MISSION

By

R. NICOL CROSS

This work is an attempt to make Socrates a living figure to modern English readers. It is a biographical and psychological study, in which the intellectual struggles, the prophetic rôle and the moral and religious grandeur of the man are portrayed against the background of the life and movements of his time.

Price, \$1.25 net

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS



Talks on D'Ooge's Latin for Beginners—III



THE SEVEREST TEST

ASK ANY TEACHER what he thinks of D'Ooge's "Latin for Beginners". We have asked a good many. We have collected the answers in a booklet which we will gladly send you. They are so flattering that it is almost immodest for us to repeat them.

ASK ANY BOARD OF EDUCATION its opinion. High Schools in forty of America's hundred largest cities, including New York, Chicago, and Boston, use D'Ooge to-day. The most popular book of any other publisher is used in only twenty-one of these cities.

ASK ANY PUPIL what he thinks of it. Wonder of wonders, you will find that many of them actually like it.



GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

NEW YORK



Smiley and Storke's FIRST YEAR LATIN COURSE

By JAMES B. SMILEY, A.M., Principal Lincoln High School, Cleveland, Ohio, and HELEN L. STORKE, A.B., Assistant Principal, West High School, Cleveland, Ohio. Price \$1.00. Teachers' Handbook and Key, Price \$0.24.

SEVEN REASONS WHY

The Use of this Book Gives { Less Work for the Teacher
Greater Reading Power for the Pupil

1. The treatment of the noun and verb in alternating series of lessons.
2. Early and frequent practice in the use of the subjunctive mood.
3. Word Lists which provide almost unlimited review exercises in form and construction.
4. The explanation of Latin Syntax in terms of English Grammar.
5. The simplification of the learning of forms.
6. The forty-six reading lessons, which definitely prepare for Caesar.
7. The review in every lesson of preceding lessons.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. IX

NEW YORK, APRIL 29, 1916

No. 25

THE SEQUENCE OF TENSES

It is a large question whether rules have yet been formulated, or can be, to cover the facts of tense usage in Latin more adequately than the rules of Sequence, and, without going into the general question, I wish merely to answer Mr. Kent's query (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9.12) "whether a student of to-day *not* trained in the Sequence of Tenses would dare to write *Roscius orabat sibi adesses cras*, as Horace did, *Serm.* 2.6.35". In another place (page 7) he affirms with emphasis that nothing but a slavish application of a principle of Sequence of tenses could produce the imperfect subjunctive in this Horatian sentence. Now it happens that there is under my close observation a class in which rules of Sequence are not taught, and it was possible to put the matter to the test. This class is reading Cicero in preparation for College entrance examinations. The larger number of its members learned rules of Sequence in their early years of Latin, but in October, 1914, a different set of rules was given to them and they were urged to forget the very small amount they then knew of Sequence. Since that time, explanations of tenses in this class have been made on the basis of the new rules only, Sequence has not been discussed, and I should be surprised if even one or two of the class could now state the Sequence formula properly. Two members were in a special class last year and they have *never* learned rules of Sequence.

The test paper was made up of three English sentences for translation into Latin, in class and without assistance; the second sentence was *He was begging you to be there to-morrow*. I hoped that no student on whose general understanding I may usually rely would dare *not* to write the imperfect. In stating the result of the test, I must sacrifice pride and perhaps discretion, for bad blunders are to be reported. Let me plead in defence of teacher and pupils that, when the test was made, on October 26, the class had been under training less than three weeks after a vacation of more than four months. Nineteen Latin versions of the sentence were given. The imperfect subjunctive appeared in 13, the present subjunctive in 4, the perfect subjunctive in 1, and the pluperfect subjunctive in 1. For the perfect or the pluperfect no defence could be made from the new rules: the two pupils that used these tenses simply failed. Something, perhaps, may be said for the present; that it is at least not impossible

in this connection is suggested by such passages as Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 19, *De Lege Agraria* 3.3, *Pro Flacco* 21, *Pro Caecina* 99, where in volitive clauses a present is found in dependence on a past tense.

The two pupils who have never studied Sequence rules were among those who wrote the imperfect; and it seems that something other than slavery to a mechanical rule so fortified thirteen brave souls that they dared to write what Horace wrote.

THE BREARLEY SCHOOL,
New York City.

SUSAN FOWLER.

THE SEQUENCE OF TENSES

As a teacher who two years ago discarded the rule for Sequence of Tenses as a working rule, I was much interested in Professor Kent's article, The 'Passing' of the Sequence of Tenses (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9.2-7, 9-13). In several respects his position seems to me open to question.

I. The value of a mechanical rule is not great if the number of exceptions to it is large. On page 3 Professor Kent makes the following statement: "In dependent clauses taking the subjunctive primary tenses are used in dependence upon primary tenses in the main clause and secondary in dependence upon secondary". But, by certain statements which he makes later in the paper, he modifies the rule as just given in certain important particulars, thus showing that in itself it is an inadequate formulation of the facts. These modifications may be grouped under three heads.

(1) The tense of the dependent subjunctive is sometimes determined by the tense of a verb *not in the main clause*, i.e. the clause to which the dependent subjunctive is grammatically subordinate.

(a) On page 9, under A, he states that the tense of a dependent subjunctive may be due to the influence of a verb in the same sentence, but not governing the clause in which the subjunctive in question stands, i.e. not 'main' in respect to that subjunctive. Under this head, with other illustrative sentences, he cites the following from Cicero *Cat.* 3.21, *Illud vero nonne ita praesens est ut nutu Iovis Optimi Maximi factum esse videatur, ut cum hodierno die mane per Forum meo iussu et coniurati et eorum indices in aedem Concordiae ducerentur, eo ipso tempore signum statueretur?*, explaining *ducerentur* and *statueretur* as in dependence upon *factum esse*, in spite of the fact that the result

clause is in apposition with, and anticipated by *illud*, which is the subject of *est*.

(b) On page 10, under E, he says that the tense of the subjunctive verb may be determined by a shift in the thought *not indicated by the main verb*.

(c) The tense of parenthetical purpose clauses is explained (page 11, under H) as due to a verb that is understood.

(d) The tense of a dependent subjunctive is said to be sometimes due to a verb in a preceding sentence, as in Cicero Ad Att. 4.16.1 (page 12, init.).

(2) The deciding factor is not always *tense*, but sometimes a *time idea* suggested by the main verb (page 11, under J).

(3) On page 11, under G, Professor Kent states that the tense of a dependent subjunctive may be due to repraesentatio, "a principle well known, involving the retention of primary tenses under conditions which seem to call for secondary tenses".

II. If Professor Kent uses the terms 'absolute' and 'relative' as they are generally used, the implication of the following statement (page 3, column 2, init.) seems to me incorrect: "That the subjunctive tenses should, then, denote relative time rather than absolute time in dependent clauses would be no surprising phenomenon". Strictly speaking, no time is absolute except the present. Any past act or any future act may be thought of with reference to the moment of speaking, whether or not a verb referring to that time is used in the sentence. On the other hand the term 'absolute' is usually employed of an act that is not referred in time to any other act that is mentioned in the sentence. In the latter sense the following subjunctives cited by Professor Kent are absolute: (page 11) Cicero Tusc. 1.3; Cicero De Lege Agr. 2.93; Cicero Ad Fam. 13.6.4; Caesar B.G. 6.35.2; Cicero Pomp. 42; Tacitus Ann. 1.76.6; Livy 6.40.17; Terence Phor. 933-934; Pliny Epp. 6.6.3; Cicero Pro Quint. 89.

III. The fact that not all subjunctives express absolute time is no *proof* that they must all express relative time. There is still the possibility, which Professor Kent has failed to consider, that the principle determining the use of the tenses of the subjunctive is a principle midway between the theory of Professor Hale and the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses; that is, the theory that the tenses of the subjunctive, as well as the tenses of the indicative, express sometimes absolute time, sometimes relative time.

IV. The material examined by Professor Kent was too limited in extent. Even the addition to this material of Cicero's Orations only, to go no farther afield, would show a large number of sentences containing violations of the rule for Sequence of Tenses, violations that occur not at all, or at most very seldom, in the works from which the citations were made. For instance, in Cicero's Orations there appear many instances of a perfect subjunctive in dependence

on a past tense, such as relative clauses in indirect discourse, 92; causal (not *cum*), 22; adversative (not *cum*), 3; *cum*-temporal, 16; conditional clauses, 19; relative subjunctive clauses (characteristic, causal, and adversative), 99.

V. The fact that general truths are frequently expressed by the imperfect subjunctive when they are in dependence on a past tense does not necessarily prove that there is a mechanical rule for Sequence of tenses. In order to establish without question the existence of such a rule, it would be necessary first to show that all tenses of the indicative in their change to the tenses of the subjunctive in indirect discourse are subject to the same restrictions, and secondly to prove that it is impossible to give any logical explanation for these restrictions. Both are impossible. In the first place, the mechanical rule for Sequence does not always hold good in the case of a perfect indicative in dependence upon another perfect indicative, for the former is often represented by the perfect subjunctive, not by the pluperfect. Secondly, a logical explanation is possible. When one quotes the words of a speaker or writer indirectly, he looks back at the present of the original speaker, which for the second speaker is a past, and views from that standpoint all the actions mentioned by the original speaker. As what he says is a quotation, as a rule he puts nothing of his own into the quotation except the change of viewpoint from the present to the past. In consequence of this change in his point of view he uses the particular past that corresponds to the present of the original speaker, i.e. an imperfect subjunctive to represent a present indicative or subjunctive. Of the 13 sentences cited by Professor Kent (page 4, init.), the great majority are quoted sentences. In Cicero Cat. 3.11, Quanta conscientiae vis esset ostendit, beyond the persistence of commentators in calling *esset* the expression of a general truth, I know of nothing to prove that Cicero did not mean to say that on that particular occasion Lentulus showed the strength of his conscience, hardened as it was.

VI. The statement made by Professor Kent (page 10, under C) that "result clauses employ the tenses in their indicative values" is not in complete accord with the facts of the Latin language. For instance, substantive result clauses, which practically always contain the imperfect subjunctive when they depend on a past tense, often express an action to be conceived as a whole, an action that would of necessity be expressed by the perfect subjunctive if the statement just quoted from Professor Kent's paper is to be used without qualification.

VII. On page 12, ad fin., there appears the following statement: "It may be left to an intelligent teacher which method is more easily operable and which will produce the better results". As a concrete example of the results obtained by the study of Sequence I wish to cite an answer given on examination by a good

student. In accounting for the tense of *abstraxerit* in Pro Archia 12, Tot annos ita vivo ut a nullius umquam me tempore otium meum abstraxerit, he wrote as follows: "*Abstraxerit* is in the perfect subjunctive. It is primary because it follows the primary verb *vivo*. It is in the perfect because it denotes completed action, i.e. action past in comparison with that of the main verb".

On page 7 a sentence from Horace Serm. 2.6.32-37 is cited as an argument for the existence of a mechanical rule for the sequence of tenses. The first part of the paper concludes with this sentence: "After all nothing but a slavish application of a principle of sequence of tenses could produce *cras adesses* and *hodie meminisses reverti*". As an experiment I made a list of sentences containing one sentence modelled on *cras adesses*, and gave the list without comment to a class that has had one semester of Vergil and to a class that has been reading Caesar for one semester. These students have never learned Sequence of tenses, but have been taught that the tenses of the indicative and subjunctive express time in certain definite ways, sometimes relatively and sometimes absolutely. The four students in the Vergil class wrote the imperfect subjunctive. Of the Caesar students, 1, who is in the class only on trial, wrote the perfect subjunctive, 1 the infinitive, 2 the present subjunctive, and 12 the imperfect subjunctive.

In conclusion I wish to say that I shall be very glad to give to any believer in the doctrine of Sequence of Tenses a considerable number of English sentences that I have written, based on sentences in Cicero's orations. To those who are willing to send me a statement of their ideas regarding the tenses to be used, I will send in return references to the passages on which my sentences are based, that they may challenge my interpretation if they wish, and may see for themselves how far the doctrine of Sequence, even with the aid of all the exceptions given by the Latin Grammarians, will permit them to use on their own initiative the tenses used by Cicero.

THE PACKER COLLEGIATE
INSTITUTE,
Brooklyn, New York.

ELIZABETH MCJIMSEY TYNG.

Miss Tyng's comments on my paper are an interesting contribution to the discussion of the problem, but I see no reason to change my position. I may be permitted to reply to her points one by one.

I. The value of the mechanical rule of the Sequence of Tenses is very great, for the *percentage* of exceptions to it is small. Naturally any rule, if compressed within a few words, is an incomplete statement of the class of phenomena with which it deals, and must be supplemented and qualified by other statements. I admit almost all of what Miss Tyng says, without feeling that I have abandoned my ground. Yet, when she makes an italicized point that in some of these qualifications the "tense of the dependent verb is determined by the tense of a verb *not in the main clause*", I must protest;

of course, when I spoke of "primary tenses in the main clause", the term *main clause* was used relatively: that is, the *main clause* here meant is the clause upon which the clause taking the subjunctive depends, though this main clause may itself be subordinate to another clause. Evidently my formulation of the rule falls short of the pedagogical principle which I try to keep before myself in stating any rule of grammar: *State a rule not merely in such a way that it ought to be understood, but so that it cannot be misunderstood.*

II. I have used the term 'absolute' in its usual meaning as defined by Miss Tyng, except that, by inserting three words, I should make the definition run: "Absolute is usually employed of an act that is not referred in time to any other act that is mentioned <explicitly or implicitly> in the context". With regard to the examples which she lists, I stand by what I said in my previous paper.

III. Middle ground between the position of Professor Hale and a rigorous application of the Sequence rule to absolutely all instances is indeed taken in the second half of my paper, pages 10-12.

IV. The reason for limiting the amount of material considered in my paper was given on page 3, footnote 10. With regard to Miss Tyng's statistics in this connection, I desire to remark that not every "perfect subjunctive dependent upon a past tense" violates the principle of Sequence, and consequently not all of her 251 examples of this character in Cicero's Orations alone are of necessity exceptions to the Sequence rule.

V. As for the putting of general truths into the secondary tenses when dependent upon a secondary tense, I agree with Miss Tyng on the psychology of the process, but consider that this establishes a definite status of Sequence. But I cannot agree that Cicero in Cat. 3.11, Quanta conscientiae vis esset ostendit, may mean "Lentulus showed the power of *his* conscience on that particular occasion", rather than a general statement about the power of conscience. Cicero would hardly be holding up Lentulus as a model of conscientiousness; but even if we admit that this may be a particular statement, how does Miss Tyng account for the tense? And when she has done this, how would she account for the perfect subjunctive in Cic. Ad Fam. 13.6.5 Harum litterarum quanta vis fuerit, propediem iudicabo?

VI. I have always found it impossible to argue on points of grammar without the concrete examples before me as a working basis, and I can therefore hardly discuss the behavior of tenses in result clauses, and especially the aoristic nature of the acts where the imperfect is employed; but there is a close kinship between substantive clauses of result and substantive clauses of purpose (so-called; Professor Bennett's "derived from the volitive"), which may explain the use of the imperfect in this category where the perfect would be more logical. After all, the Romans cannot be assumed to have been infallible in their use of

language, any more than the writers of English (compare the popular articles by Professor Lounsbury in Harper's Monthly Magazine), and many usages listed solemnly in all our Grammars are unquestionably solecisms on the part of the Roman writers. (N. B. I am not here making specific charges!).

VII. The answer given by a good student trained under the Sequence rule, in explaining *abstraxerit* in Arch. 12 tot annos ita vivo ut a nullius umquam me tempore otium meum abstraxerit, surprises me only because it comes so near being correct. It would be a pleasure to see how a good student trained without the Sequence rule would explain it; for in either instance it would be necessary to show how the result of an action expressed by a present tense form can be expressed by a perfect tense form. How many students of Cicero's Orations have grasped the meaning of the present to express time past which continues also into the present?

The results obtained from translation back into Latin of sentences modeled on Horace Serm. 2.6.34-37 (32, 33 and the prior part of 34 are irrelevant), interest me exceedingly, but several questions come up in my thoughts: What is the rule or set of rules by which Miss Tyng has trained those students? How was the English of the sentences framed? How would the students themselves account for the tense which they used?

And this brings me to the most difficult point of all, which goes back to Miss Tyng's third point. Miss Tyng gives in a few words a formulation of her belief as to the value of the tenses of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses; but this view, as far as I know, has never been upheld in extenso; and, until such support has been given to it, it cannot be made the object of a refutation in detail. Such a detailed exposition by Miss Tyng would be a welcome addition to the literature of the subject.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

SEQUENCE, HARMONY, AND THE JOINT REPORT

If the Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature is to accomplish its very desirable purpose, there must be no general misunderstanding of any of its important recommendations. That such part of the Report as deals with the statement and explanation of what has been known as the Sequence of Tenses is susceptible of very serious misunderstanding is made evident by two papers which appeared in 1915, one by Professor A. T. Walker, of the University of Kansas¹, and the other by Professor R. G. Kent, of the University of Pennsylvania².

The Report of the Joint Committee, in its statement of the tense relations between main and subordinate verbs, has followed quite closely the views that Pro-

fessor Hale had set forth previously, in much greater detail, in regard to Latin Sequence³, and the writers of both the papers mentioned above have considered themselves justified in interpreting the Report in the light of Professor Hale's own presentation of his views.

Professor Hale contends that both indicative and subjunctive subordinate tenses, in Latin, tell their own story, regardless of the tense of the main verb; that when, for example, a subordinate subjunctive with a present point of reference is needed, in dependence upon a main verb of past time, the present or perfect subjunctive is freely used. He even went so far as to say that there was no such thing as what was ordinarily taught as Sequence of Tenses, though he admitted later that this statement was "certainly incautious"⁴.

A grammatical rule is, essentially, a statement of common usage, but if it stops there, without giving, or suggesting, such fundamental reasons for the usage as are easily available, it may, conceivably, do great harm, by tending to prevent intelligent understanding. To say that '*idoneus* takes the dative', may seem sufficient to explain a particular instance of such use. To call it a 'dative with adjectives of fitness, etc.' is a short step in advance. To recognize it as a dative of purpose or service is to get behind the form to the idea.

Professor Hale's chief objection to the ordinary rule for Sequence, though he does not put it in just this form, seems to be that it merely states a fact, and that, by its form of statement, and by the mechanical method of teaching to which it easily lends itself, it tends to conceal the real reason for that fact, which lies in the meaning of the tenses themselves, and, in principle, concerns subordinate indicatives as well as subjunctives.

Professor Walker objects to the Committee's treatment of tense relationship chiefly because it is made to apply equally to these two modes, and he shows very clearly the great disproportion, in Latin, between the number of subordinate indicatives unrelated to the time of their main verbs, and the number of corresponding subjunctives. It might reasonably be argued that such disproportion furnishes no sufficient cause for the entire omission of the indicative mode from the discussion. But what renders Professor Walker's position wholly untenable is the fact that he is considering only Latin, while the statement of the Report covers the Modern Languages as well. Subordinate subjunctives, in French, are much freer, in tense, than in Latin, even in formal writing, while, in the conversational style, the imperfect and past perfect subjunctive have practically disappeared. In German, indirect statements and questions, dependent upon a past main verb, regularly use present and perfect subjunctives, where, in English, we use past and past perfect indicatives, e. g. sie glaubten dass es wahr sei, 'they believed it was true'. As for English, the dearth of subjunctive forms makes it still more necessary that any general statement

¹The Classical Journal, 10.246-251, 291-299.

²THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 9.2-7, 9-13.

³The American Journal of Philology, 7.446-465; 8.46-77; 9.158-177.

⁴A. J. P. 8.59.

should include indicatives. The Report, therefore, in making no distinction between the two modes, has taken the only possible course.

Professor Kent (page 2) is more positive even than Professor Walker in his belief that

the Joint Committee . . . saw fit to adopt Professor Hale's interpretation of tense meaning in Latin, and to recommend that the use of tenses in Latin be taught along the lines advocated by him in the articles already mentioned.

But so far as I know, he has the field all to himself in insisting (page 6) that

the central point of his <Professor Hale's> teaching is that the subordinate subjunctives denote absolute time and not relative time, so far as concerns the verb of the clause on which they depend.

Again he says (page 6):

What Professor Hale insists upon, is that the tenses of subordinate subjunctives tell their own tale, absolutely; which, after all, means, relatively to the temporal standpoint of the speaker or writer.

It seems almost impossible that any one could read through carefully Professor Hale's articles and come to this conclusion, though there are in them several independent statements that might easily be interpreted in that way. But when Professor Kent claims that the Joint Committee "has seen fit to adopt" this interpretation, he is entirely and demonstrably in error. The Report says (page 61):

A group of acts thus connected in our thought will generally lie in the same division of time. Moreover, we generally see these acts *in their temporal relation to each other*. The most important one will take the lead in our thought, and the rest will be looked at with reference to it If, then, we have a past principal act, accompanied by expressions of situation and purpose, the situation will naturally be a past situation, and the purpose a past purpose.

The change of name from 'sequence' to 'harmony', which is mildly recommended by the Committee, on the ground that the latter term better describes the phenomena involved, is of comparatively little importance, if the two terms are to be considered equivalent. The Report, however, seems to set forth, as an essential feature of 'harmony', the statement found in the first sentence of the passage last quoted, namely, that the main verb and its subordinates are generally in the same division of time, past, present, or future, in relation to the time of writing or utterance. In the nature of the case, past perfect and past present tenses always indicate time which, like that of their main verb, is previous to the time of utterance; and a future future (*veniet ut videat*) or a future present (*videbo quid faciat*) must indicate, like its future main verb, a time later than the time of utterance. But the very large number of present perfects and present futures (*timeo ne veniat*) never indicate the same time as that of their main verb, and a past future may be either in the absolute past, present, or future, except as indicated by

the context. The absolute time of a past future is ordinarily a matter of indifference, except in the case of the result of a past act, and here, if it is desired to show by the tense whether this result is itself actually present or past, the point of reference shifts to the time of the writer or speaker, and a present or perfect subjunctive takes the place of the usual imperfect. The Report says that absence of harmony "happens in one of the two following ways: (1) The acts may be in different divisions of time, . . . (2) The acts may be in the same division". Instances of harmony might be similarly classified. The whole question of whether or not the main verb and its subordinates are in the same absolute time is not at all material to the question of the relation of tenses, and, when combined with it, tends to confusion.

In the rule for Sequence, as ordinarily given—that primary tenses follow primary, and secondary, secondary—there are two serious defects, which, so far as I know, have not been specifically noted, though their effects have been clearly seen in the necessity for special explanation of apparent exceptions. One of these defects is the fundamental fallacy involved in the use of the terms primary and secondary each with two different meanings in the same sentence. In connection with main verbs, i. e. verbs to which other verbs in the subjunctive or indicative are subordinate, the term secondary applies to tenses indicating a past time relative to the time of utterance; the term primary, to all other tenses. Let us call these tenses in a main verb 'secondary (main)' and 'primary (main)'. In connection with subordinate verbs, the term 'secondary' applies to the tenses usually associated with secondary (main) tenses, i. e. to tenses with a past point of reference, the term primary to the other tenses. Let these be called 'secondary (subordinate)', and 'primary (subordinate)'. (The fact that 'secondary (subordinate)' tenses cannot indicate absolute present or future time, and so are also 'secondary (main)', and that 'primary (subordinate)' tenses are generally 'primary (main)' may be worth noting, but is immaterial to the discussion). A subordinate perfect, therefore, that indicates past time, and itself has a subordinate verb, is at one and the same time, and in a perfectly legitimate and logical way, both 'primary (subordinate)' and 'secondary (main)'.

This analysis makes unnecessary, and, in my opinion, shows to be erroneous the metaphysical subtlety⁵ involved in calling the perfect tense a "mediator between the two spheres" of completed and incomplete time, and in speaking of it as if it had a dual nature, which enabled it to possess, at the same time, two mutually exclusive qualities.

Moreover, this double meaning of the terms primary and secondary is apparently the cause of what seems to me a serious error. Professor Bennett⁶ calls the per-

⁵Professor Kent, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 9.9; Professor Hale, A. J. P.

⁶Latin Grammar, 268.6.

fect subjunctive of result, dependent upon a past tense, a secondary tense; and Professor Kent says (page 10) that it is both primary and secondary. Of course, it is secondary (main), and would be regularly followed, if by any subjunctive tense, by an imperfect or pluperfect; but what they both evidently mean is that it is a secondary tense in relation to its past main verb, i. e. secondary (subordinate). The line of reasoning seems to run somewhat as follows: the perfect subjunctive of past time is both primary (subordinate) and secondary (main); if the double meaning of these terms is not clearly seen, the tense then seems to have both a primary and a secondary nature, and so, because of its secondary nature, to be correctly used after a past tense; which, being interpreted, means that because it is sometimes a secondary (main) tense, it may also be correctly used as a secondary (subordinate) tense—a perfect *non-sequitur*, this might be called.

The second objection to the ordinary Sequence rule is that it makes no provision for double or multiple subordination. Pedagogically, this objection is more serious than the first, and is productive of much confusion. In the case of any such series of successively dependent verbs, it may safely be said that a past tense, anywhere in the line, establishes a past point of reference for succeeding subjunctives. This includes, of course, perfect infinitives, as well as perfect subjunctives. A perfect or pluperfect subjunctive, thus dependent upon two verbs, may refer to time previous to either; only the sense will show which. In *dixit omnis copias quas arcessisset mox venturas*, the subjunctive is a real past perfect; in *dixit se statim venturum si de eorum adventu cognovisset*, it is a past future perfect; in *dixit se facturum quod imperatum esset*, it might be either.

One other point, of minor importance, may here be quoted. The only principle behind any rule of subjunctive Sequence is the strong tendency of subordinate subjunctives to have for their point of reference the time of the main verb. But because subjunctive tenses make no distinction between present and future points of reference, the principle of relationship in tense is sometimes disregarded without any apparent breaking of the rule of Sequence. This occurs in a less vivid future conditional complex when a present subjunctive in the condition refers to time previous to a main verb of future time. Compare Cicero Acad. 2.80 *Si deus te interroget, quid respondeas?* Caesar B. G. 2.21.5 *Temporis tanta fuit exiguitas ut . . . tempus defuerit.* These two subordinate subjunctives are alike in showing no relationship to the time of the main verb, but only in the second sentence is this lack of relationship counted as an exception to the rule of Sequence. In both sentences the subordinate verb has for its point of reference the time of writing or utterance. In result clauses after a past tense, this has the very definite advantage of greater accuracy. The imperfect tense in the result merely indicates a later time than its past cause (which would go without saying), and sometimes

seems to have kept its earlier potential notion of probable result or tendency. The perfect or present tense not only shows the result as an actual fact, but also indicates whether, at the time of writing or speaking, that fact is past or present.

What I conceive to be Professor Hale's main contention seems to me entirely sound, and I cannot see why pupils should not be taught from the first that the real reason for the choice of imperfect and pluperfect subjunctives after a verb of past time is that these two tenses, like the ordinary uses of the corresponding indicative tenses, refer to actions from a past point of reference, and that similar fundamental tense meanings lie behind the choice of the other two tenses. Such an understanding will prepare them for a large part of the comparatively small number of exceptional tense combinations to be found in their later reading, where, for various reasons, the point of reference for the subordinate verb is not indicated by the main verb. On the other hand, Professor Walker seems fully justified in insisting on the value of a special rule, in Latin, for the tenses of subordinate subjunctives. The objections set forth above to the form in which this rule is ordinarily given may be met as follows: first, by entirely discarding the terms primary and secondary as applied to subordinate tenses in their relation to the main verb? (the terms 'primary sequence' and 'secondary sequence' are too convenient to lose, and mean simply the usual combinations of subordinate tenses with primary or secondary main verbs); secondly, by broadening the statement to include double subordination. The rule, for Sequence only, might then run somewhat as follows: A subjunctive which depends, directly or indirectly, upon a verb of past time is regularly in the imperfect or pluperfect, otherwise, in the present or perfect.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY,
Andover, Mass.

B. M. ALLEN.

A careful reading of Mr. Allen's paper impels me to add little to the discussion. He makes an able defense of the Report of the Joint Committee, but what I wish to say is already in my paper in this periodical (9.2-7, 9-13). May I call particular attention to the last column of that paper (9.13), where I discussed the merits of the terms Sequence and Harmony in reference to the various languages in the school curricula? But Mr. Allen's concluding lines please me, especially his formulation of the rule for Sequence, since it leaves no ambiguity as to instances of double subordination; the old statement, "primary tenses follow primary, and secondary, secondary", has always been anathema to me. My own pet formulation of the rule, which I am now (almost) ready to discard in favor of Mr. Allen's, I gave in the first part of my paper (9.3, column 1, lines 6-9). But Mr. Allen seems to me, in his last lines, to admit the existence of a real principle of Sequence!

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

¹This has been done in the Grammars of Lane and of Allen and Greenough, as well as in a very few elementary text-books.

REVIEWS

Biblical Libraries. By Ernest Cushing Richardson. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1914). Pp. 252. \$1.25.

This volume on Biblical Libraries and an earlier volume by the same author, entitled *The Beginnings of Libraries* (1914), give together a connected account of the history of libraries from the earliest times down to a time well within the Christian era. The earlier volume covers the legendary, prehistoric, and primitive period to about 3400 B.C., while the present volume, carrying the narrative on from this point, deals with the period of authenticated history. The author had already published various essays dealing with the subject of these books, but no attempt was made in them to give a complete outline of the subject. The series introduced by *The Beginnings of Libraries* and *Biblical Libraries* presents the result of a reshaping of the material of the essays and aims to give a general survey of the whole period treated, without going into full detail. Biblical libraries are treated chronologically under twelve heads: The Babylonian Period, The Patriarchal Period, The Egyptian Period, The Exodus, Palestine and the Conquest, Period of the Judges, Saul to the Captivity, The Persian Period, New Testament Times in Palestine, Roman Libraries in Apostolical Times, Post-Apostolical Roman Library Buildings, The Bible itself a Library. There are also an introductory chapter dealing with the question, What is a Library? and a final chapter containing a Bibliography.

The word library is defined by the author, for the purposes of this book, as "any collection of books kept for use". There has been a tendency among Assyriologists to define the term in such a way as to exclude from its scope every collection of books before Ashurbanapal's; thus was denied the existence of libraries before that of Ashurbanapal. Long before the great Nineveh library, however, there were numberless collections, large and small, of books or documents, which were kept for use, as distinguished from collections which were kept for other purposes, as, for instance, for sale. These were sometimes attached to temples or temple-schools and contained records of various sorts, letters, contracts, deeds, wills, etc., and religious texts or exercises, and they were sometimes kept in private storerooms and contained, perhaps, records of a business firm or family documents. Surely the author is right in holding that the term library should not be withheld from such collections as these.

In Pre-Abrahamic times, up to about 2000 B. C., the history of Biblical libraries is the history of Babylonian and Sumerian libraries. Most of the cities mentioned in the Bible in this period had collections of books. About 200,000 works, which were in the form of tablets, have been unearthed, but many more probably remain to be discovered. Three of the most interesting libraries of this period are those of Lagash (where about 30,000 tablets have been found), Sippara (50,000 tablets), and Nippur (60,000 tablets).

The evidence for libraries in Palestine in early times is meager, but it seems probable that Palestine had a continuous culture from before the time of Abraham to the Conquest, and that there were also collections of records there at an early period.

In Egypt public records, religious texts, medical texts, annals and the like had probably existed for 2000 years before Abraham's visit (1950-1900 B. C.). The pyramid texts and the Palermo stone (c. 2700 B. C.), the earliest recorded Egyptian records, furnish indications of previously existing records. In the records of Thutmose's Syrian Wars there are illustrated the elements of the usual method of annalistic record-keeping of the time.

The records of the campaign were taken day by day on a roll and, with other rolls giving account of commissary and tribute matters, were deposited in the palace library. From both sources a regular register was written up on a leather roll and put in the temple library and an epitome of this was in turn published by carving on the walls of the temple.

At the time of the Exodus there were in Egypt numberless libraries, public and private, and literature of many kinds was abundant. The later connection of Egyptian library history and Biblical history is briefly touched upon.

Following the Exodus, library conditions in Palestine at the Conquest, during the period of the Judges, and down to the Captivity are traced. The great library of Ashurbanapal at Nineveh dates from the eighth century or the seventh century B. C. In the Persian period the libraries at Ecbatana and Susa receive special attention. Of special interest to classical students are the chapters beginning with The Greek Period. Greek libraries first come in touch with Biblical history at the time of the Septuagint. The library at Pergamon is important because it served to fix the type of the libraries of that and a later time. Roman public libraries began under Augustus. The libraries at Jerusalem represent a Roman modification of the Hellenic type. Various classes of libraries existed in Palestine in New Testament times: temple libraries, public Greek libraries, synagogue libraries, libraries of the Essenes, etc. Private libraries were also common. In apostolical and post-apostolical times libraries were numerous in all settled parts of the Empire. Many of these receive more than passing notice, while four—all of the post-apostolical times—are described in some detail: the Ulpian library at Rome, the Celsius library at Ephesus, Hadrian's library at Athens, the library at Timgad in North Africa.

Much of the evidence for the existence of early book-collections is necessarily indirect. Direct and indirect evidence are here arrayed in a way to give us a very readable and interesting account of the subject. We gain from it, as was designed, a general and outline view of the field. For a more detailed study we should go to the literature cited in the Bibliography or to other technical works not there cited. In the course of the

narrative various interesting points come up for discussion; e. g. the meaning and use of various words and expressions, such as *library*, *archive*, *word*, *book* (*davar*, *logos*), *words of days*, *Bible*, etc., the historicity of the Ark, and methods of early annalistic record-making. The work is furnished with numerous illustrations, giving the ground-plans of buildings, etc., and with a full index.

Cambridge, Mass.

JOHN W. H. WALDEN.

An Index of the Adverbs of Terence. By E. A. Junks. London: Oxford University Press (1915). Pp.

31.

The brief Preface to this pamphlet informs us that it follows a similar Index of the Adverbs of Plautus by the author and a collaborator. Why would any man care to prepare two such fragmentary works instead of taking a little more time and producing a complete index to Terence? Nevertheless even this *opusculum* may be of service to some.

It is admittedly not easy to say precisely what words are adverbs and what are not, and it is a safe guess that no other man would agree with our author on that point. He omits *non* and *ne*, but includes *minus* in its negative use; omits *nihil*, but includes *paulum* and *paululum*; omits *quom*, but includes *tum*, *nunc*, *iam*, and *ubi* (temporal); omits both *non* and *dum*, but includes *nondum*; omits *quo* (except in its local sense), but includes *qui* (even when a mere variant for *ut*). We meet such case-forms as *gratiis*, *necessario*, *domi*, *domum*, but other case-forms with an equal right to be called adverbs, e. g. *tanto*, 'by so much', *Athenas*, 'to Athens', are not listed.

Aside from these omissions, which are clearly intentional, only one mistake has been observed. The two instances of *ut* = *quo modo* in *Andria* 805 are not recorded.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

The Stoic Philosophy: Conway Memorial Lecture, by Gilbert Murray. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1915). Pp. 74. 75 cents.

This is the sixth memorial lecture in memory of Moncure D. Conway. The lectures are delivered periodically by distinguished men "to further the cause of social, political and religious freedom with which Dr. Conway's name must ever be associated".

Any treatment of such a subject in a single lecture must necessarily be cursory and from a limited point of view. Professor Murray approaches his task, he says, as a psychologist rather than as a philosopher or a historian. He thinks that the Stoic system possesses a permanent interest for the human race and is a permanent power of inspiration. He sketches briefly Zeno's problem—a discredited traditional religion and the necessity of replacing it with some religion or philosophy to serve as a guide in the threatening chaos. Zeno, by his uncompromising materialism and insistence on the

truth of sense-impressions, postulated a very real and very knowable world. In it nothing but goodness is good. Nothing but goodness, that is, is worth living for. External things do not really count.

Goodness consists in performing one's function well. *Phusis*, the law or process of growth exemplified in all things, is shaping each thing towards such fulfillment of its function. Goodness is, then, "acting according to Nature", not in the sense of "living like the natural man", but rather in coöperating with *Phusis* in her eternal efforts towards perfection. She is the spirit which makes the world grow and progress—the law of nature, the soul, in fact, of the world. This purpose of the great world-process is, in a sense, alive, and is the nearest approach to a definite personal God that the austere logic of Stoicism allowed. The Stoic God is an extremely fine "intellectual fire" permeating all creation. God is in everything and all things are working together for good, according to *Phusis*, i. e. in harmony with the will of God. To this harmony, bad men are an exception, for God has left man, alone of all things, free to work with or against the world-process.

There are two types of Stoic and both are orthodox—he who defies the world and scorns earthly things, and he who works with the world-process, helping God to effect the welfare of man. True it is, that, if nothing but goodness is good, man's welfare is worthless and so not worth effecting, but man must perform his function all the same. The outcome is of no importance. The main thing is that a free and conscious will has been active. Contempt for pleasure in this life is not, as in some religions, preparation for higher pleasure in a life to come. All man can expect is loss of individual existence in the fiery substance of the divine soul, though many Stoics thought that such absorption could not be final.

God stands to man in the relation of an eternal friend. Much is made of Bevan's phrase, "a friend behind phenomena". The assumption is one which all religions make, and which philosophy cannot avoid, try as it may. Stoicism, starting out to exclude all appeal to tradition and mere mythology, does not in fact make the tremendous assumption of a beneficent Purpose, akin to ourselves, and accepts, as an argument for this, the consensus of all mankind—a consensus due not so much to an intellectual judgment as to a craving of the whole nature. Professor Murray sees here another proof of the enormous dominion exercised over man by his sub-conscious, non-intellectual forces. Is not this universal assumption of the friend behind phenomena, he asks in closing, founded, as it is, neither on reason, nor on observation, in its origin, the groping of a lonely-souled gregarious animal to find its herd or its herd-leader in the great spaces between the stars?

The book is delightful reading. It has the literary charm that characterizes everything Professor Murray writes and it gives an excellent glimpse into the heart and essence of the Stoic Philosophy.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT.

The THOUGHT in the Subject Matter

It is truly said that even in Vergil classes a large percentage of the pupils feel that the Latin text was written solely as an exercise in forms and syntax. There is a very dim idea that the particular text—Caesar, Cicero, or Vergil—represents a contribution to the world's literature.

An aid in better translation work, in encouraging the pupil to get at the thought, has been the LAKE SERIES plan of the *notes at the foot of the study page with the separate text for class use*. This is found in

WALKER'S CAESAR

JOHNSTON & KINGERY'S CICERO

KNAPP'S VERGIL

Do you know them? Have you ever tried WALKER'S CAESAR, for example, with a pupil who is doing unsatisfactory work with another Caesar?

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND CO.

8-12 East 34th St., NEW YORK CITY

Is it worth while to try to teach Latin Word Formation?

If you have had doubts, it was because you did not have the proper tools. You need clear, simple statements; familiar words for illustrations; and plenty of examples for practice, **from words that your pupils have had or will have**. There is one little book that will give you these things—**JENKS'S LATIN WORD FORMATION**.

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

Latin for the First Year

By W. B. GUNNISON, Ph.D., Principal, and WALTER S. HARLEY, A.M., Instructor in Latin, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn

344 pages, \$1.00

A New Latin Text for Beginners

based on the Caesar vocabulary, but so arranged as to prepare for the study of other Latin authors as well.

Its Chief Aims

are to achieve the utmost simplicity of treatment consistent with thoroughness and to make the study of Latin interesting.

Distinguishing Features

Gradual and logical development of inflections.
Omission of non-essentials of syntax.
Frequent summaries and reviews.
Fables and anecdotes from Latin classics for sight reading.
Excellence of typography, arrangement, and illustrations.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

DERIVATION OF WORDS IN LATIN

A Handy and Useful Pamphlet for Secondary Schools
Approved wherever used. Price 15 cents

"I used the pamphlet last year in my Latin class and found it admirably adapted to High School work".—Mabel A. Dawson, Elyria, Ohio.

Address the Author,

Ambrose C. Richardson

47 Fargo Avenue,

Buffalo, N. Y.

Bob Starts for College

A Pamphlet of 8 pages on the Value of Studying Greek in College

Issued by

The Classical Association of the Middle West and South

Copies, 1 cent each; 25 for 20 cents; 100 for 70 cents.

Address: **PUBLICITY COMMITTEE,**
11 Hall of Liberal Arts, Iowa City, Iowa

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October 1 to May 31 inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Barnard College, Broadway and 120th St., New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY) are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership in The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year. Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year. If affidavit to bill for subscription is required, the fee must be paid by the subscriber. Subscribers in Canada or other foreign countries must send 30 cents extra for postage.

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

CHARLES E. BENNETT, Cornell University
WALTER DENNISON, Swarthmore College
WALTON B. MCDANIEL, University of Pennsylvania
DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University
B. L. ULLMAN, University of Pittsburgh
H. H. YEAMES, Hobart College

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York City.

Single copies, 10 cents. Extra numbers, 10 cents each. \$1.00 per dozen.

Printed by W. F. Humphrey, 300 Pulteney St., Geneva, N. Y.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

Organized in November, 1906

Membership April 30, 1915—704

Dues - - - - - \$2.00 per annum

(The year runs from May 1 to April 30)

President

PROFESSOR CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Cornell University

Secretary-Treasurer

PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP
Barnard College, New York City

Vice-Presidents

Professor Harold L. Cleasby, Syracuse University.

Professor Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Mr. W. W. King, Barringer High School, Newark, N. J.

Miss Jessie E. Allen, Girls' High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Professor Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del.

Miss Mary B. Rockwood, Western High School, Baltimore, Md.

Professor Charles S. Smith, George Washington University, D. of C.



IN response to numerous inquiries, Dr. Charles Upson Clark wishes to announce that he will conduct as usual the Massawippi Summer School (Ninth Season), at North Hatley, Quebec.

Courses are offered in Latin Composition, Medieval Latin Literature, Greek, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, Advanced Mathematics, and all College preparatory subjects. Illustrated booklet mailed on request.

Dr. Clark has put on sale his extensive collection of lantern slides illustrating Spanish and Italian Art, Roman Remains in Spain, Southern France and Northern Italy; the Rhone Valley, Venice and the Veneto (Verona, Ravenna, etc.), the Riviera, Spain, Cuba, Porto Rico and Florida. He has also for sale a set of the new Encyclopaedia Britannica (india paper) and a few other books.

Address: 18 Phelps Hall, Yale University.